

## REMARKS

In the Office Action of March 5, 2010, claims 2-9 and 19 were provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 2-9 of co-pending Application No. 10/056,096. In addition, claims 2-4 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,114,996 (“Nghiem”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,764,190 (“Murch et al.”). Furthermore, claims 5-9 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nghiem and Murch et al. in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,002,367 (“Engblom et al.”). Lastly, claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nghiem and Murch et al. in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,054,953 (“Lindmark”).

On May 4, 2010, a personal interview between the undersigned attorney and Examiner Yuwen Pan was conducted. In the personal interview, proposed amendments to the independent claim 19 were discussed with respect to the cited references of Nghiem and Murch et al. As a result, Examiner Pan indicated that the independent claim 19 would overcome the current rejection if amended as discussed. However, no agreement was reached.

In response, Applicants have amended the independent claim 19 according to the interview discussion to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references of Nghiem and Murch et al. Support for the amendments to claim 19 can be found at least in paragraphs [0032], [0033] and [0042] of the current application, as published. Claims 2 and 3 have been also amended. In view of the claim amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that the independent claim 19 and the dependent claims 2-9, 20 and 21 are now in condition for allowance.

With respect to the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejections of claims 2-9 and 19, Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections are no longer applicable in view of the claim amendments.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Boyle et al.

By: /thomas h. ham/

Thomas H. Ham

Registration No. 43,654

Telephone: (925) 249-1300

Date: May 18, 2010